	Case 1:23-cv-00726-JLT-CDB	Document 17	Filed 06/11/25	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	DAMIEN STEVENSON,		ase No.: 1:23-cv-0072		
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH TO FILE RESPONSIVE		
13	V.		WITHIN WHICH TO FILE RESPONSIVE PLEADING		
14	B. PHILLIPS, et al.,  Defendants.		(Doc. 16)		
15					
16					
17	Plaintiff Damien Stevenson is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights				
18	action.				
19	I. INTRODUCTION	N			
20	On April 11, 2025, this Court issued its First Screening Order (Doc. 9) and on April 15,				
21	2025, it issued its Order Finding Service Appropriate (Doc. 10).				
22	On April 17, 2025, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation filed its				
23	Notice of E-Service Waiver form. (Doc. 12.)				
24	Thereafter, the screening and service orders served to Plaintiff were returned by the				
25	United States Postal Service marked undeliverable on April 23 and April 24, 2025.				
26	On May 12, 2025, Defendants filed the Waiver of Service of Summons form. (Doc. 13.)				
27	On June 4, 2025, the undersigned issued Findings and Recommendations to dismiss this				
28	action without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to obey the Local Rules and failure to prosecute.				

1 (Doc. 15.) Specifically, dismissal was recommended for Plaintiff's failure to keep the Court 2 apprised of his current address. (*Id.* at 2-5.) 3 On June 10, 2025, Defendants filed a request for an extension of time to file a responsive 4 pleading. (Doc. 16.) 5 II. **DISCUSSION** 6 Defendants ask the Court to vacate the current deadline for filing a responsive pleading 7 considering the pending Findings and Recommendations to dismiss this action for Plaintiff's 8 failure to obey the Local Rules and failure to prosecute. (Doc. 16.) Defendants state that if the 9 assigned district judge adopts the pending recommendations, the action will be dismissed, and a 10 responsive pleading will be unnecessary. (Id., at 3,  $\P$  3.) In the event the recommendations were 11 not adopted, Defendants state the current June 16, 2025, deadline could be reset to a later date. 12 (Id.)13 The Court finds good cause to vacate the current deadline for the filing of a responsive 14 pleading. 15 III. **CONCLUSION AND ORDER** 16 Accordingly, the Court **HEREBY ORDERS**: 17 1. Defendants' First Request for Extension of Time to File Responsive Pleading (Doc. 16) is **GRANTED**; 18 19 2. The June 16, 2025, deadline for filing a responsive pleading is **VACATED**; and 20 3. The Court will reset the deadline for filing a responsive pleading following disposition 21 of the pending Findings and Recommendations by District Judge Jennifer L. Thurston, 22 if necessary. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26

Dated: **June 11, 2025** 

27

24

25

28

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE